



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/013,541	01/26/1998	JOHAN P.M.G. LINNARTZ	PHN16210 3468	
24737 73	590 08/17/2004		EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INT P.O. BOX 3001	ELLECTUAL PROI	MEISLAHN, DOUGLAS J		
	BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.





Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	2
09/013,541	LINNARTZ, JOHAN P.M.G.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Douglas J. Meislahn	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
 a)
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>28 June 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) \(\square\) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE:
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected:
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet BEST AVAILABLE COPY OUT MULLINGER
BEST AVAILABLE COPY SUSPENDINGER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive. The 101 rejection is proper because the claimed material fails to support specific data manipulation functions. A computer program, which the claimed material is not, supports data manipulation functions. The claimed material is ordered data, which is, according to statute, unpatentable. The examiner cannot change this law. With respect to the art rejection, applicant engages in a piecemeal analysis of the rejection. The previous office action clearly shows which sections of the prior art render obvious the specific elements of the claims. Were the amendments entered, the examiner believes that the new claims and claims 35 and 38 would be allowable. The 112 rejection exists because of the discrepancy between "encoding means" and "encoder means".

BEST AVAILABLE COPY